

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the above-referenced patent application. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended, and claims 10-13 have been added. It is noted that claims 1 and 5 were not amended to overcome the rejections and objections, or in light of the cited references. Rather, claims 1 and 5 were amended to clearly delineate claimed subject matter. Furthermore, it is believed that these amendments do not narrow claim scope. Rather, in some cases, the claims are even broadened. Therefore, no prosecution history estoppel should result from these claim amendments. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that the specification supports new claims 10-13. For example, support may be found in paragraphs [0023]-[0024] and Fig. 3.

In the Office Action, dated June 1st, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Evanisko (US Patent No. 5,394,314). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Evanisko is directed toward a snap fitted reflector for cold cathode lamps, and does not recite a lamp holder as claimed by Assignee. As just an example, Evanisko describes "The reflector is of C-shaped cross-section and is dimensioned for releasable snap fitting to the cold cathode tube along the tube length with the interior channel surface facing the peripheral surface of the tube such that only a portion of the peripheral surface of the tube along its length is exposed to the ambient atmosphere." (col 1:61-col 1:67).

Assignee respectfully submits that Evanisko does not disclose each and every element of the rejected claims, as amended, and, therefore, a prima facie case under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) has not been established. As just an example, referring to claim 1, Evanisko does not show or describe a lamp holder and lamp, "wherein the lamp has a length shorter than the length of the lamp holder, and wherein the structure is capable of reflecting light over a linear dimension larger than the length of the lamp."

Evanisko does not show or describe at least one element of claim 1, as amended, and, therefore a prima facie case under 102(b) has not been established. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejection to claim 1.

It is noted that many other bases for traversing the rejection could be provided, but Assignee believes that this ground is sufficient. Assignee respectfully submits that because Evanisko does not disclose each and every element of the rejected claims, a prima facie case under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) has not been established, and claim 1, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Additionally, claims 2-4 and 10-13 are in a condition for allowance for the same and/or similar reasons as presented with reference to claim 1, as amended. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejections of these claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims pending in this patent application, as amended, are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, she is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 439-6500. Reconsideration of this patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account number 50-3130.

Dated: _____

9/21/05

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Willardson
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 50,856

Berkeley Law and Technology Group, LLC
1700 NW 167th Place, Suite 240
Beaverton, OR 97006